

The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly from November through April by the Department of Classical Languages at Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 8, Missouri. Subscription price: \$2.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter at the Saint Louis, Missouri, Post-Office under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME 34

March 1958

NUMBER 5

Themistius and the Classical Tradition

As we study the tension and rivalry between Christianity and paganism in the fourth century of our era, and the different forces which were in play on the opposite sides, we must not forget that, so far as externals were concerned, Christians and pagans were living in the same world, and, quite literally, were speaking the same language. Exercising as it does a special attraction for scholars concerned with the emancipation and growth of the Church, this century is becoming better and better known as new texts are found and old ones re-studied. Our widening understanding of this epoch gives us new insights into the spread of Christianity, and our increasing knowledge of paganism enables us to appreciate better what it was that Christianity overcame and displaced.

One of the significant figures of this time whose work is becoming better known is the Greek *rhetor* Themistius of Constantinople, who was born ca. A.D. 317. Best known to some modern scholars for his paraphrases of Aristotle, which were written in order to make Aristotle's philosophy more widely known, Themistius was famous in his own day for his success as a teacher of oratory and philosophy. He left a number of discourses and essays on philosophical, rhetorical, and political themes which were highly valued by succeeding generations and were carefully preserved, although Themistius was a pagan and a friend of the Emperor Julian the Apostate. We possess about thirty-seven discourses, some of which have come to light only recently.

A Last Advocate of Paganism

The only modern edition of the orations is that edited by W. Dindorf at Leipzig, in 1832. This is now exceedingly rare (Harduin's edition of 1684 is much easier to obtain), and it is apparently because of this—as also perhaps because of Themistius' ornate and often difficult style—that this rather important collection of writings is not better known. A new edition, by the present writer, is in preparation.¹ In the meantime, several studies of Themistius' philosophical and political doctrines have been published,² and a translation of one of his most characteristic political discourses, the first address to the Emperor Constantius, dated ca. A.D. 350, will it is hoped soon appear.³

In this issue . . .

- Themistius and the Classical Tradition
Glanville Downey 49
- Medea in Dido
D. Herbert Abel 51
- Higher Education for Women—and Antiquity
Editorial 54
- Pigs and Epicureans
Phillip DeLacy 55
- Breviora*: Letter on *Athenagoras* Review (J. H. Crehan, S.J., page 57). "Assent" in Plato's *Respublica* (Sister M. Renelle Ojeman, S.S.N.D., page 57). Voices Prophetic? (Lawrence A. Mann, page 57).
- Book Reviews*: Maurice van der Mijsbrugghe, editor, *P. Cornelius Tacitus* (Raymond Victor Schoder, S.J., page 57). Two Cumont Reprints: Franz Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra and Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (Francis Joseph Guentner, S.J., page 57). Waldo E. Sweet, *Latin: A Structural Approach* (Martin D. O'Keefe, S.J., page 58). Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J., *Insight* (Charles Leo Sweeney, S.J., page 58). L. R. Lind, editor, *Latin Poetry in Verse Translation* (John E. Rexine, page 59). Walter R. Agard, *The Greek Mind* (John E. Rexine, page 59).
- Materials Available through the Office of THE
CLASSICAL BULLETIN 60

As one of the last great advocates of paganism in the Greek-speaking part of the Roman Empire, Themistius ranks with his contemporaries Libanius and the Emperor Julian; and in his efforts to save paganism, he was in some ways the most practical of the three, and it may be that his contribution was the most lasting. Like Libanius and Julian, Themistius was simply unable to understand Christianity. Very likely he never made any effort himself to discover its real meaning, and no Christian apologist capable of persuading him seems to have reached him. We must remember that he witnessed the unattractive outward manifestations of the Christological controversies without being able to understand their crucial importance for the Christians. Like other pagans, Themistius failed to perceive anything of the living force of Christianity, and failed to recognize that, unlike paganism, it was a growing and creative movement. On the contrary, Julian and Themistius could see Christianity only as a danger to the state and society, in that it threatened (as they believed) to ruin literature, undermine morals, and alienate the traditional gods upon whose favor the safety and prosperity of the state depended. Libanius ignored Christianity; the Emperor Julian fought it; Themistius competed with it. Themistius set himself to show, tactfully but energetically, that paganism offered ethical

teaching and spiritual values which (he and his peers supposed) were every bit as good as the Christian teaching, if not better. Christianity, the pagans claimed, had taken much of its doctrine about the nature of man and human relationships from pagan teachers, notably Plato; and the intelligent person naturally ought to prefer the genuine article to the imitation.

In addition, Themistius emphasized that it was the classical educational system that had produced the great Roman emperors of former days, and it was this system, he declared without sparing anybody's blushes, that was responsible for the success and the noble characters of the sovereigns of the modern world before whom he spoke.

Themistius to the Emperors

Themistius set forth these views in a series of addresses to the successive emperors from Constantius (before whom he first spoke, ca. A.D. 350) to Theodosius the Great (A.D. 379-395), during whose reign Themistius died (A.D. 388). He won a lasting place for himself at the imperial court in Constantinople, where he was the respected and honored adviser of the emperors, and was probably looked upon as the unofficial representative of the pagans, whose existence the Christian emperors had to acknowledge; and he did more than simply maintain his position, for the Emperor Theodosius made Themistius the tutor of the crown prince and future emperor, Arcadius.

Themistius' philosophy was an eclectic system, in which Plato's teaching formed the largest single element, along with some quotations from Aristotle's *Ethica Nicomachea*. The work of Socrates as a teacher of ethics is, Themistius declares, the model he himself is trying to follow; and he emphasizes that his own goal, like that of Socrates, is democratic, unlike the aristocratic tendencies of his snobbish enemies and rivals, the sophists. Themistius had the mission (as he presents it) of reviving classical philosophy, not only as a guide of life for ordinary people, but as an essential element in the training of the emperors and their sons. He devoted careful study to the traditional Greek virtues, and to the way in which they were to be learned and exercised. In addition—and this is apparently his own innovation—he wrote and spoke, constantly and in detail, on *φιλανθρωπία*, "love of mankind" (which does not wholly correspond to Latin *humanitas*). This, Themistius maintained on many occasions, was the greatest of all the virtues, and summed up and comprehended all the rest. It was the real goal of the private individual in his struggle for perfection, and it was also the chief and most characteristic virtue of the ruler, both in his personal character and in his relations with his subjects. One is tempted to think that in his develop-

ment of *φιλανθρωπία* Themistius was trying to establish a pagan counterpart to the Christian *ἀγάπη*. By this time, the Christians were frequently using the term *φιλανθρωπία*, and here again Themistius may have been trying to suggest that the Christians had borrowed a pagan concept.

It was not the pagans alone who were the advocates of the classical tradition, of course, and it is here that we can begin to understand what it was that both the pagans and the Christians were trying to do in the new world in which Christianity had suddenly emerged as a major factor in public life. After an initial period of doubt and mixed opinions, Christian thinkers began to see that, if one omitted certain material which was obviously unsuitable (which some pagans, indeed, had found objectionable), there was a great deal of classical literature that was of the highest value for educational purposes. There were also practical considerations, first, that training in the classical system, and specifically in rhetoric, was necessary for anybody, pagan or Christian, who wished to engage in public life; and second, that Christian apologists and teachers ought to have a knowledge of pagan philosophy and religion so as to be able to meet pagans on their own ground. We find the contribution of Hellenism to Christian thought in the writings of the Cappadocian Fathers, Chrysostom and Nemesius of Emesa; Basil of Caesarea's essay addressed to his nephews, on the value of classical studies for Christian young men, is the well known and representative treatment of the subject.⁴

Pagan Literature for Educational Ends

This, of course, is familiar to modern Christian classical scholars. It is, however, worth pointing out that while the Christian thinkers of the fourth century were reaching the point at which they were sure they needed the Greek classics in their educational system, Themistius and the other pagan leaders were busy trying to show, from their own point of view, that the classical educational scheme was the best available, and that it had been tried and had produced highly satisfactory results. They also claimed (or implied, like Themistius) that this system was superior to the Christian program. It is obvious—we do not need to be reminded of it—that it was the universal validity and the universal applicability of the classical heritage that both pagans and Christians saw, though their outlook was different, and each saw the Greek achievement in a different light. Themistius and Basil of Caesarea, if they had been able to discuss the subject, would have found much in common, up to a certain limit, but beyond that they would not have been able to agree. Yet on the basic point—the value of the classics—there could be no question.

There that both sidered t primary classical body of must be working a teacher What th acquired learn th part of entered of the t was bas things t tion its Christia role of Master isted also

Thus and the was for gram v anity w own en by the helps u in whic passed mistius save cl tell. It that C mistius to hol classic ing ou with i educat agreed (whet mistiu preser tion in

Dumb

1 Th will in Heinri mained Themis "Them berg, avec l' rowicz lenism (Mün Ethics

There is another feature of the classical tradition that both pagans and Christians would have considered to be of basic significance, and that is the primary role of the teacher, and the function of the classical literature as teaching material—that is, a body of knowledge, and a stylistic standard, which must be taught and handed down by a teacher, working as an individual, and must be learned from a teacher by a student, also acting as an individual. What the classics had to give could not really be acquired just by reading books. The pupil had to learn the tradition from a master who was himself part of the tradition, and in the process the student entered into the heritage and himself became a part of the tradition. The whole of ancient education was based on this idea, and this was one of the things that, to Themistius, gave the classical tradition its validity and its living and creative strength. Christians, of course, had their own concept of the role of the teacher, going back to the work of the Master himself, and oral tradition had always existed alongside the transmission of the Scriptures.

Thus the classical tradition, as regards its form and the way it was taught, was not something that was foreign to Christian ideas. The classical program was capable of being adapted, and Christianity was capable of taking over and using for its own ends the insights which had been worked out by the Greek thinkers. The activity of Themistius helps us to gain a clearer understanding of the way in which the best elements of the classical heritage passed over into the service of Christianity. Themistius may or may not have thought that he could save classical civilization as such; we cannot now tell. It seems doubtful that he supposed, with Julian, that Christianity could be forcibly displaced. Themistius tried to do what he could. His method was to hold up before successive rulers the ideals of classical education and classical philosophy, pointing out the close association of classical education with ideal rulership. He then implied blandly that educated people, and intelligent rulers, naturally agreed with this view of the classics. In this way (whether or not he intended just this result) Themistius was able to make a real contribution to the preservation of the classical heritage and its absorption into Christian civilization.

Dumbarton Oaks

Glanville Downey

NOTES

1 This edition, which will include an English translation, will incorporate the results of the researches on the MSS by Heinrich Schenkl, who was preparing a new text which remained unfinished at his death. For the life and works of Themistius an excellent account is available: W. Stegemann, "Themistios," *RE* 5A. 1642-1680. 2 See especially V. Valdenberg, "Discours politiques de Thémistius dans leur rapport avec l'antiquité," *Byzantion* 1 (1924) 557-580; E. H. Kantorowicz, "Kaiser Friedrich II. und das Königsbild des Hellenismus," *Varia Variorum: Festgabe für Karl Reinhardt* (Münster 1952) 171; *idem*, "On Transformations of Apolline Ethics," *Charites: Festschrift Ernst Langlotz* (Bonn 1957)

Medea in Dido

If the tragedies of Aeschylus are, as he claims, slices from the great banquet that is Homer, perhaps the reverse may be stated for *Aeneis* 4, where Vergil's epic seems to be a slice from the great banquet of Greek tragic drama. Aeneas certainly has an Iliadic history; Homer deliberately saved him for Vergil, with Poseidon's help, of course, for when in *Ilias* 20 Aeneas is sorely wounded by Achilles, the sea god cried aloud to his fellow immortals:

... Come, let us guide him out of death's way, lest the son of Cronus be wroth, if Achilles slay him; for it is appointed to him to escape, that the race of Dardanus perish not without seed or sign. ... But thus shall the might of Aeneas reign among the Trojans, and his children's children, who shall be born in the aftertime.

Dido, however, does not come from Homer, nor is the character of Medea in Apollonius' epic, the *Argonautica*, her prototype. She has no background in epic, unless it be from the early Latin poet, Naevius, who seems to have invented or adopted a legend which brought Aeneas in the course of his wanderings between Troy and Latium to Carthage where Queen Dido reigned. When Vergil in turn borrowed this legend, he found himself with a love motif foreign to Homer, but one that was a favorite of the Alexandrine Greek poets and of their Latin disciples, such as Catullus. But the generally frivolous and lightsome treatment of love, which those poets employed, was not in the spirit of Augustus' views on morality. The later relegation of Ovid to Tomi shows what might have been the fate of Vergil, had he handled the love story of his characters in any other way than in a tragic spirit, "as a fearful obstacle which the hero has to overcome in his moral progress and as the prelude of disasters to come in the relations of Rome and Carthage."¹

The Fourth Book as a Tragedy

That Vergil succeeded in making a tragedy of *Aeneis* 4 there can be little question. Centuries later Saint Augustine, in speaking of his early training and studies in literature, says:

... tenere cogebat Aeneae nesciocius errores, oblitus errorum meorum, et plorare Didonem mortuam, quia se occidit ab amore, cum interea me ipsum in his a te morientem, Deus, vita mea, sicis oculis ferrem miserrimus (*Conf.* 1.13).

Nor can we doubt that Vergil clothed this episode with compelling interest and powerful emotional ap-

267, 270-271; G. Downey, "Philanthropia in Religion and Statecraft in the Fourth Century after Christ," *Historia* 4 (1955) 199-208; *idem*, "Education and Public Problems as Seen by Themistius," *TAPA* 86 (1955) 291-307; *idem*, "Education in the Christian Roman Empire: Christian and Pagan Theories under Constantine and his Successors," *Speculum* 32 (1957) 56-61. Extracts in translation from Themistius' fifth oration appear among the political texts edited by Ernest Barker, *From Alexander to Constantine* (Oxford 1956) 377-380. 3 In the new journal, *Greek and Byzantine Studies*, which is to be inaugurated at San Antonio, Texas. 4 The most convenient edition of this is the text, with translation, edited by R. J. Deferrari and M. R. P. McGuire in the fourth volume of the Loeb Classical Library edition of Basil's letters edited by R. J. Deferrari, 365-435.

peal. His unfortunate fellow poet, Ovid, trying to justify his own use of the love *motif* by citing every poet who ever wrote on the subject, says:

et tamen ille tuae felix *Aeneidos* auctor
contulit in Tyrios arma virumque toros.
nec legitur pars ulla magis de corpore toto,
quam non legitimo foedere iunctus amor
(*Tr.* 2.533-536).

Ovid fails to mention that, whereas his ladies in the *Ars Amatoria* are gay people, Vergil assigns the epithet *infelix* to his heroine. None the less, the heartfelt interest of the Romans in the plight and tragedy of the love-tossed queen seems well established by these two statements, separated by four centuries of reading and studying this pagan bible.

Dido, therefore, stands as a tragic heroine, and the development of her story follows more the scheme of tragic drama, particularly Euripidean, than that of epic. One of the most popular of Euripides' plays, the *Hippolytus*, begins with a conversation between the young wife, Phaedra, and the Nurse; Dido's story begins with a talk between herself and Anna. Sophocles employs the device of having two sisters, the one being a foil for the other: the one frenzied and headstrong, the other sensible and practical, such as Antigone and Ismene, or Electra and Chrysothemis. In *Aeneis* 4 Dido is the frenzied and Anna the calm sister. Like all tragic protagonists, Dido has a tragic flaw, a *culpa*, which reveals itself when she breaks her vow to be faithful to her dead husband, Sychaeus. She is essentially, however, as protagonists generally are, a good person, a great person, a courageous, resourceful, and highly successful ruler of this land which she has wrested from Iarbas. With a masterful feeling for the organic unity of his story Vergil depicts her inevitable progress to her final catastrophe, from the moment of her recognition of the nature of her *culpa*:

Solus hic inflexit sensus animumque labantem
impulit. Agnosco veteris vestigia flammae (4.22-23).

Devices Stressing Tragic Element

An interesting side-note here is the alliteration of the fricative in: *veteris vestigia flammae*, a device which Vergil uses elsewhere for the nauseating or repulsive. Further dramatic force arises from the technique which places the principal action in the speeches of the characters rather than in the narration. At the catastrophe Dido decides on self-destruction; but first, just as Oedipus curses his sons, so she invokes the wrath of men who are to be on the one who, she thinks, has wronged her. There is also the Euripidean *deus ex machina*; she is not allowed even to die by herself; Iris settles the sad issue by releasing Dido's tortured soul from her body. The introduction of the personification of Rumor and Rumor's trip to the palace of Iarbas (4.173-197) resembles the choral interlude of a Greek tragedy.

Finally, Vergil explicitly enrolls Dido in the company of tragic protagonists by comparing her wild, deserted, and frenzied wandering in her dream to the plight of Pentheus at Thebes in Euripides' *Bacchae*, or to that of Orestes and the Dire Sisters at the doorway in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* (4.469-473).

There can be little question, therefore, of the essentially tragic substance and form of *Aeneis* 4. There is also little doubt that for the Romans the most popular Greek tragic heroine, from Lucius Livius Andronicus to Seneca the Younger, was the spurned princess of Colchis, Medea. But the Medea of Euripides' tragedy has been happily married to Jason and has borne him children. Her love has assured her immortality, for in the words of Aeschylus' Electra: "Children are memory's voices, and preserve the dead from wholly dying." The spurning of Medea by Jason comes after love's fulfillment. Dido's pain is that of unrequited, unfulfilled love, the pain of a woman loving a man in vain, loving a man who tolerates being loved and who is satisfied to accept love but not to give it. A major difference between Medea and Dido is that for the Carthaginian Queen no tiny Aeneas is playing in the hall, whose face may image his father's (4.327-330). There are further differences between the two heroines just as provocative of comment.

Differences Between Medea and Dido

One cannot maintain that the theme of the Jason-Medea story is the same as the theme of the Aeneas-Dido episode, because the circumstances of the action and the motives of the characters are quite different. Vergil's heroine is a widow "sick in the heart of bridal torch and chamber" (4.17), who nevertheless manages to fall in love with a widower; her love life is a failure because her beloved sails away and leaves her abandoned. Medea on the contrary is a young, vibrant girl, fascinated by a dashing and gallant adventurer; she succeeds in managing a successful elopement.

The character of Dido is consistent, natural, believable. The character of Medea, as found in Apollonius, is a strange and almost forbidding figure. Although a mere girl, she is already a princess of Hecate. In her chamber she has a chest of horrors, the drugs and potions of her trade. Yet she is portrayed as a simple maiden, afraid of her father, devoted to her elder sister and mother. She is fond of her girl's finery and very affectionate with her handmaids. When she is distressed she is found weeping in her sister's arms. When Jason leaves the hall, her glance follows him and her peace of mind is gone forever. She retires to her chamber, cursing and blessing him by turns, cursing him for her lost serenity, blessing him for what he is. She thinks of his handsome, dignified face, his clothing, the tones

of his voice, the way he sat, his bearing, and the music of his talk.

In both the *Aeneis* and the *Argonautica* the sister of the heroine serves as confidant; but whereas in Apollonius' epic Chalciope is interested in the fate of her own sons and not in Medea's infatuation, Anna in the *Aeneis* resembles Antigone's sister, Ismene, in having no interest except that of serving her sister. The dream episode in the *Argonautica* is Medea's romantic fantasy: she dreams that Jason has had her in mind all the time and has come to Colchis not for the Golden Fleece but for her. In the *Aeneis* Dido's dream is made of sterner stuff, fashioned from her sorrows and fears and expressing the horrors of her grim foreboding (4.465-473). In the *Argonautica*, Medea has our sympathy, but not our pity and love, throughout the story. Her conduct is determined by the dart of Eros; she is a pawn in the hands of the gods. Human action as the outgrowth of human resolution is a superfluity. In the *Aeneis* the superfluities are the gods: Cupid did not need to assume the form of Ascanius or to be fondled by Dido (1.715-719), because Dido was already aflame with love for Aeneas (1.613).

Vergil's Use of Apollonius' Epic

All this makes us a bit wary of the statement of Servius in his opening commentary on *Aeneis* 4, when he says: *Apollonius Argonautica scripsit, et in tertio inducit amantem Medeam: inde totus hic liber translatus est*. It would appear that *Aeneis* 4 is far from being a mere translation of the *Argonautica*. Vergil was, of course, influenced to some extent by it, just as he was influenced by the works of others of his predecessors, both Greek and Roman. Venus speaking to Vulcan (8.383) says: *Te potuit lacrimis Tithonia flectere coniunx*, and by so doing shows that Vergil is well conversant with the episode in the now-lost epic, *Aethiopis*, in which Aurora begged armor for Prince Memnon. He was indebted to Ennius, to Naevius, to Lucretius, to *frag.* 36 of the choral Greek poet, Alcman, to the entire corpus of poetry that preceded him. But in my opinion, the *Argonautica* served him rather as an example of excesses or faults to be avoided than as excellences to be imitated.

The first two books of the *Argonautica*, a poem of adventure, contain some very uninteresting geography in the description of the journey to Colchis. Here, too, Apollonius does not hurry the reader in *medias res* to stimulate interest with significant action, as Vergil does. He begins really in the beginning, with the sandal that Jason lost in the mud. Pelias, forewarned that he would be slain by a man wearing one sandal, promptly sends Jason on what promises to be an impossible quest for the Golden Fleece. There follows a tiresome catalogue of heroes,

two hundred lustreless verses long, a number which Vergil prudently pruned and enlivened in *Aeneis* 7.

Further Differences

The boxing match of Pollux and Amycus in *Argonautica* 2 is a bloody affair, reproducing the Homeric savagery which the more tender spirited Vergil tried to soften even in his battle scenes, by inserting pathetic touches, as in the deaths of the identical twins, Laridus and Thymer (10.390-396). In *Argonautica* 3 the Muse of Love is invoked; and in *Aeneis* 7 Vergil invokes Erato, but there is a significant difference, which Vergil stresses with the words: *maius opus moveo*. With the winning of the Golden Fleece Jason has gained his goal. Of course, there are further problems and adventures, because the heroes have to return to Greece somehow, but the *Argonautica* ends in anticlimax. As Professor Rand has pointed out,² there should be some guiding idea above and beyond the adventure, and there is none. Vergil profited in correcting this mistake. In the *Argonautica* magical and mystic rites and incantations, the awful powers of the unseen, are the natural thing for Medea to do; they are mere everyday exercises of her skill. When Dido in her extremity has recourse to magic, she intends such rites to be a trick to deceive her sister, hardly daring to entertain the hope they might succeed in winning, if not her lover, oblivion for herself.

Aside from these points of major comparison or contrast, there are some sixteen short passages, mostly of incidental decoration, where the lines from the *Aeneis* seem to come directly from the Greek poet, Apollonius. The two most striking such cases are the cave scene in *Argonautica* 4.1141-1149, with *Aeneis* 4.124-127; and the description of night in *Argonautica* 3.744-751, which is possibly an echo of Alcman's *frag.* 36, with *Aeneis* 4.522-528. The sum total of parallel passages, however, is far from impressive in making out a case for the influence of Apollonius on Vergil. In contrast, let me cite the fact that there are sixty-two such parallel passages or references to the *Iliad* occurring in *Aeneis* 4.

It is difficult, then, to see the Medea in Dido. For my part, I believe a much better argument for the influencing of Dido's character might be made for Catullus 64. There is much more than a vague similarity between our Aeneas, *regni rerumque obliterate* (4.267), and Theseus, the *immemor iuvenis* of Catullus' epyllion (64.58), and between our *regina e speculis* (4.586), and the Ariadne *prospectans* (64.60-67) as Catullus depicts her standing amid the breakers on the beach, looking out to sea after her vanishing hero, all disheveled and distraught. Catullus must, of course, since he is writing of a wedding party and bridal gifts, end on a gay note

(Concluded on page 56)

The Classical Bulletin

Published by the Department of Classical Languages
at Saint Louis University

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

William Charles Korfmacher.....	Editor
Chauncey Edgar Finch.....	Associate Editor
Francis Joseph Guentner, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Marcus Anthony Haworth, S.J.....	Associate Editor
Francis Charles Hunleth, S.J.....	Associate Editor

Address: 3647 West Pine Boulevard, Saint Louis 8, Missouri
Subscription: \$2.00 per year. Single copies: 40c. To members of the ACL, CAAS, CAMWS, CANE, and CAPS, \$1.60 per year through the Office of the Secretary-Treasurer of each of these organizations.

Concerning subscriptions, renewals, books, pamphlets, advertising, and the like, please address the Editor. Concerning manuscripts for possible publication, address any member of the Committee.

Volume 34 March 1958 Number 5

EDITORIAL

Higher Education for Women—and Antiquity

Symptomatic of the panic-type thinking now so prevalent among those concerned with the future challenge to American higher education as the numbers applying threaten to mount astronomically is the widely publicized article entitled "Keep Women Out of College!" appearing in the syndicated *This Week Magazine* on Sunday, February 9, 1958. It is the output of Philip Ward Burton, professor of journalism at Syracuse University, who lists two reasons why the number of women accepted at co-educational schools should be drastically reduced: "1. Men need the college degree more than women need it. 2. Most women have less sensible, or less demanding, reasons for a college education."

If Mr. Burton was largely concerned with producing a sensation, he has succeeded. If he was interested in promoting the greater good of future American society, he would seem to have been less fortunate. Without any examination of his basic "reasons," one must insist at once that our present world and the world of the immediate future need, as never before, intelligently trained men and women in ever increasing numbers. Our concern must be, not alone for livelihood, but for living.

Once again, as in so many problems of the present day, the story of ancient Greece and Rome is at hand to aid and abet our present thinking. Sometimes that story is *positive*, inculcating by example ways of thinking and living that have universal validity. Sometimes, as is largely true in the present instance, the story is *negative*, warning us by the failures of ancient society to be wary of such mistakes ourselves.

On the one hand, the pagan societies of Greece and Rome have left us an imposing tradition of

monogamy. Despite constant contacts with Oriental society with its acceptance of the harem as an institution, Greece and Rome steadfastly held to the ideal of one wife to one husband. Divorce, to be sure, was accepted, though its practice at Rome seems to have been late; marital infidelity, particularly on the part of the husband, was unfortunately common; yet the basic ideal, socially and legally, of monogamy persisted.

On the other hand, the accepted marriage age for girls was quite young, in their very early 'teens; for men it might be in the mid-twenties or even in the thirties. Men of the better classes would have been in school until near twenty years or so; the formal education of young women may not have gone beyond that of the elementary school. Girls of good family, to be sure, might learn much at home, from their mothers, in the domestic arts and the graces of social living; but the formal training in the arts that would put them on a par with their husbands they did not receive.

There were, of course, many happy marriages. Xenophon in his *Oeconomicus* portrays the young Ischomachus, who has himself "educated" his young wife in her duties as mistress of the household; and Tacitus, in the twenty-eighth section of his *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, pays eloquent tribute to an older day at Rome, when the children of the household were trained by their own mother or by some elderly female relative. And few memorials to a deceased wife can surpass the poignant words of Quintilian, in the preface to the sixth book of his *Institutio Oratoria*—though it is significant that he emphasizes the youthfulness of his wife in comparison with his own years as such that her death is also such as the loss of a daughter.

The widespread acceptance of the courtesan in society, both Greek and Roman, must in part be laid to the inability of many contemporary wives to be intellectually as well as socially their husbands' partners. An Aspasia at Athens, and the many other brilliant non-citizen women whom she symbolizes, demonstrates how Athenian men sought, outside the marriage bond, for feminine intelligence and wit in social interchange. Clodia at Rome, Catullus' "Lesbia," was not alone of remarkable physical beauty, but she maintained a gay and sophisticated *salon* to which the intellectual and the learned were eager to resort.

Today the trend of the times makes imperative ever greater numbers of those who can think logically and act reasonably—not husbands alone, but husbands and wives with sound training in higher learning.

—W. C. K.

Non novit virtus calamitati cedere.

—Publ. Syr. Sent. 402.

Pigs and Epicureans

There is a passage in Plato's *Respublica* which helps to explain how the Epicureans came to be called pigs. Socrates is describing (372a-c) the simplest kind of city, one in which men's basic needs are satisfied on a minimum level. They have enough clothing for protection from the cold, wheat and barley to eat, and beds of boughs. For entertainment they put wreaths on their heads and sing hymns to the gods in pleasant companionship. As their desires do not exceed their needs and their resources (cf. 373d-e), they know neither poverty nor war. Such a city, which Socrates goes so far as to call the true (*ἀληθινή*) or healthy (*ὑγιής*) city (372e), is nevertheless compared by Glaucon to a city of pigs (372d), because its citizens lack the refinements of life: tables, beds, sauces, and deserts. Perhaps Glaucon has in mind the passage in the *Odyssey* (10.242-243) where the pigs in Circe's sty are described as making their beds on the ground (*χαμαιεννάδες*; cf. also *Od.* 14.15) and eating the acorns that Circe throws to them.

Plato, Epicurus, Lucretius

As a result of Glaucon's protest, Socrates abandons the ideal of the simple city and proceeds to develop a theory of human society along entirely different lines. But this abandoned ideal is easily recognized as very nearly identical with that subsequently proclaimed by the Epicureans.¹ Lucretius' portrayal of primitive life in the fifth book of the *De Rerum Natura* is perhaps the closest parallel. There, as in the *Respublica*, we find a sufficiency of food (1391) and pleasant companionship, the "rustics" (1383) lying on the grass (1392) and crowning their heads and shoulders with wreaths (1399-1400). The pleasure that they derive from their simple music and dancing is no less than that subsequently derived from more sophisticated entertainment (1409-1411); but, just as Glaucon was not content with Socrates' "true" city, so Lucretius' rustics came to dislike acorns for food (1416),² beds of grass and boughs (1417), and clothing of skins (1418), and because of their failure to recognize a limit to their desires (1432-1433) they engaged in an endless and profitless struggle which brought with it cares (1431) and wars (1435).

The Lucretian picture is of course not entirely identical with the Platonic. Lucretius claims to be portraying primitive life, and does not suppose that it was completely without evil: men wore skins for clothing, and they fought over them just as they now fight over gold and purple (1423-1424). Even in the idealized pastoral scene in 2.29-33 Lucretius does not go so far as Plato in eliminating disease (cf. *Resp.* 372d, 373d), but says only that a sick person who lies on purple spreads gets well no more

quickly than one who lies on his plebeian dress (2.34-36). Singing hymns to the gods, which is not a part of the Lucretian scene, is nevertheless acceptable to an Epicurean, who recognizes a positive value to worship even though the gods do not respond.³

The basic attractiveness of the simple life is that it escapes conflicts and cares. In Plato's city the inhabitants confine their desires to the limit of the necessary (cf. 373d) and therefore have no occasion for strife, the implication being that so long as the population does not become excessively large the means of satisfying the "necessary" desires are at hand. Epicurus also states that "natural" wealth (that is, the provisions required for one's "natural" needs) is limited and easily obtained (*Ratae Sententiae* 15). Hence the simple life provides the tranquillity which is the Epicureans' highest good. Epicurus once said (*frag.* 207 Usener), perhaps with Plato's city in mind, that it is better to lie on a bed of boughs with confidence than to have a bed of gold and an expensive table without peace of mind; and the Epicurean "crown of ataraxy" (*Plut. Mor.* 1125c), more highly to be prized than the crown of public recognition (*ibid.* 1125d), is perhaps a reminiscence of the rustic's crown of garlands.

That the ancients recognized a similarity between the Epicurean simple life and Plato's simple city is made even more probable by the fact that Plutarch uses against Epicurus an observation very similar to one made by Socrates about the simple city. Socrates had said that the inhabitants will not be satisfied: they will want (among other things) sauces, perfumes, courtesans, cakes (*Resp.* 373a). So Plutarch argues that the pleasure-seeking Epicurean will not be content with barley and beans but will demand (among other things) sauces, perfumes, pastries, and beautiful young women (*Mor.* 1097d).⁴

Horace's "Epicurean Pig"

But if Plato's "city of pigs" is equated with the Epicurean simple life, it is only natural that the pig should become a symbol of *ἀταξία*; and this is exactly what has happened in Horace's famous poem (*Epist.* 1.4.12-16):

Inter spem curamque, timores inter et iras
omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum:
grata superveniet quae non sperabitur hora.
Me pinguem et nitidum bene curata cute vises,
cum ridere voles, Epicuri de grege porcum.

Here the poet contrasts his own contentment and physical well-being⁵ with the anxieties of Albius, who clearly lacks the peace of mind that characterizes an *Epicuri de grege porcum*.

But if the Epicurean pig is light-hearted and care-free, the opponents of Epicureanism assigned to it a less amiable character. The pig is, after all, an animal; it lacks those qualities that raise man above the animals. Thus his enemies insisted that by mak-

ing pleasure the highest good Epicurus was reducing men to the level of animals, for pleasure is the *summum pecudis bonum*.⁵ The rejection of pleasures of the intellect (history, mathematics, astronomy, and the like) in favor of pleasures of the senses is for Plutarch evidence of the Epicureans' piggishness, as it caters to that part of the soul which is most subject to feelings,⁷ and it fattens the soul like a pig on the pleasures of the body.⁸ The anti-Epicureans were no doubt helped here by the proverbial stupidity of pigs,⁹ and by the view that even among animals the pig is notable for its lack of any faculty that transcends the purely physical level. A pig's *animus* is given it merely as a preservative, to keep its flesh from spoiling.¹⁰ Whether such a view does the pig an injustice would be a matter for another inquiry.

The Pig Unfavorably Viewed

Besides stupidity, the pig was in ancient times also associated with uncleanness,¹¹ and this too is turned against the Epicureans by their opponents. In the oration *In Pisonem* Cicero addresses his enemy with the words, *Epicure noster ex hara producte, non ex schola* (37). The *hara*, or pig-sty, expresses the same idea as that found in such phrases as *lutulente Caesonine* (27), *istius impurissimae atque intemperantissimae pecudis caeno et sordibus* (72), *istius pecudis ac putidae carnis* (19), and many others strewn throughout the oration with a generous hand. Cicero is, of course, carrying things to extremes, but there is already a suggestion of this kind of criticism in Glaucon's objections to the simple city. Glaucon had been shocked at the thought of its inhabitants having no beds to lie on, and at their lack of taste and refinement. So Cicero says of Piso that there is *nihil apud hunc lautum, nihil elegans, nihil exquisitum* (67).

Thus it is that a casual remark in Plato's *Respublica* started the pig on a philosophical adventure which led him by turns to felicity and degradation.

Phillip DeLacy

Washington University

NOTES

1 On more than one occasion Epicurus accepted and defended ideas previously discarded by Plato; for example, that the gods do not concern themselves with human affairs, or even that pleasure is the good. 2 Roasted acorns were among the treats in Plato's simple city, *Resp.* 372c. 3 See A. J. Festugière, *Epicurus and his Gods*, translated by C. W. Chilton (Oxford 1955) 59-60. 4 Also at 1094a Plutarch uses the phrase "sauces and cakes" to characterize the life of the pleasure-seeker. 5 Cf. Lucretius 2.31, *corpora curant*. 6 Cic. *Fin.* 2.111; cf. 2.18, *Amic.* 20, *Acad. Post.* 1-6. 7 *τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ πάθημα*, *Mor.* 1094a. 8 *κατασφωτεῖν*, *Mor.* 1096d; cf. 1091c. 9 See for example the scholium to Pind. *Ol.* 6.152; Pseudo-Plutarch, *De Vita et Poesi Homeri* 2.126; and *Paroem. Graec.*, ed. v. Leutsch and Schneidewin, II 704-705. 10 Cic. *Fin.* 5.38. 11 See for example Semonides 7.2-4, ed. Diehl; Epictetus, *Diss.* 4.11.11, 31; and *Paroem. Graec.*, ed. v. Leutsch and Schneidewin, II 705.

Medea in Dido

(Concluded from page 53)

and tell of Ariadne's happy ending and her rescue by Bacchus (64.251-266). But for Vergil, as we have already pointed out, love is not only the sickness which the Alexandrine poets deem it; it is a tragedy, and a *fortiori* if the love affair is *non legitimo foedere*. Thus for this reason, too, that crime does not pay, I would maintain that a criminal Medea acting with impunity could never be recognized as the prototype of an Augustan age heroine.

D. Herbert Abel

Loyola University (Chicago)

NOTES

1 C. M. Bowra, from *Vergil to Milton* (London 1945) 25.
2 E. K. Rand, *The Magical Art of Virgil* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1931) 395-396.

Again Available

Leo M. Kaiser,

T. Maccius Plautus, The Captives: Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. This popular edition of the *Captivi*, heretofore available in mimeographed form, has now been planographed in a new and attractive format, with slight revisions. Orders may be placed now, for delivery at once.

Address: THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN

3647 West Pine Boulevard

Saint Louis 8, Missouri

Price: \$1.25 per copy, plus postage.

LATINITAS

Commentarii Linguae Latinae Excolendae

A new and distinctive journal—since 1953. In *Latin* throughout, for the *Latinist*

Published each quarter from the Vatican Library

Handling materials in classical studies, Latin pedagogy, Latin verse, Neo-Latin authors, philological questions, philosophy

Priced at four dollars per year

Latinitas may be ordered from the American Business Representatives:

Herbert Musurillo, S.J. Daniel L. Charlton, S.J.
Bellarmine College Sacred Heart Novitiate
Plattsburgh, New York Los Gatos, California

Marcus A. Haworth, S.J.
Saint Louis University
221 North Grand Boulevard
Saint Louis 3, Missouri

Those ordering should make their checks payable to the Representative whom they address: Father Charlton, Father Haworth, or Father Musurillo.

Breviora

Letter on *Athenagoras* Review

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN:

One of the last acts of the late Dr. Plumpe, the much-regretted editor of *Ancient Christian Writers*, was to call my attention to the notice you had given of my *Athenagoras* in that series (CB 34 [November 1957] 11-12). Three points of historical importance raised by the reviewer seem to call for some comment.

In saying (p. 25) that Athenagoras is our sole source of knowledge of legislation about the kiss of peace prior to A.D. 300, I did not overlook what is to be found on that subject in the Ethiopic version of Hippolytus' *Traditio Apostolica*, a passage with which I have dealt in another connexion in *Early Christian Baptism and the Creed* (p. 166). On the present occasion I did not cite it, as it did not occur to me that anyone would want to take that passage as legislation of the Catholic Church prior to 300. It may represent what Hippolytus would have liked to introduce as such, but I do not see how anyone could take it as genuine legislation accepted by the orthodox.

The date of the Christ-Helios mosaic from the Julii tomb under Saint Peter's is by your reviewer put at "hardly earlier than the middle of the third century." Now the tomb was made before the end of the second century, and had a very short existence as a pagan tomb, there being only two cremation burials preserved and a record of the burial of a pagan child of two years of age. The Christian re-decoration of the tomb cannot therefore be postponed for a long period after the first use made of the tomb. I see that Miss Toynbee (in Toynbee and Perkins, *The Shrine of St. Peter*, p. 72) considers the mosaics as "not likely to be later than the middle of the third century," while Othmar Perler (*Die Mosaiken der Juliergruft*, p. 6) puts the change of religion as not long after the erecting of the tomb. The earliest dated evidence of the pagan cult of *Sol Invictus* in the West comes from A.D. 158 (CIL VI. 715), and after that one can expect some Christians in the West to start thinking about Christ as one more powerful than the vaunted *Sol* of the pagans. The patristic passages which Perler cites as illustrative of the theme of the mosaic are taken from a wide period, but the most impressive, to my mind, are the two from Melito, a second-century author, and one from Hippolytus, and there is another passage, not cited by Perler, which is equally impressive, to be found in Egerton Papyrus 3, a document of the second century; (see my *Early Christian Baptism*, p. 34). If one has to assign a date for the mosaic, it seems to me that it is safer to put it in the second century than the third, though, of course, no one would say that it was *early* in that century.

The third point concerns the value of what Tertullian has to say about the persecution of the Christians. Your reviewer accepts Tertullian's rhetorical cry: *Nominis proelium* as sober history, but surely we have enough experience of persecuting governments now to know that while this is always the real issue, the government has the skill to put up some rags of scandal or imputations of malice that will bring the persecuted into contempt. That was all I meant to say by remarking that it was ludicrous to suppose that the emperors proscribed the Name and said nothing about *flagitia coherencia nomini*. It is worth noting that Pliny, when he could not find such *flagitia*, thought Christians might be made to suffer for "their stiff-necked obstinacy"; that was a charge which Tertullian would have found it hard to meet.

J. H. Crehan, S.J.

114 Mount Street,
London, W. 1

"Assent" in Plato's *Respublica*

Plato has long been acclaimed a consummate master of style, but each reading of his work reveals another facet of his mastery, and causes it to gleam with new luster. One of these facets is the variety of expression he uses for his interlocutors to show agreement with, or acquiescence in, a statement made by the principal speaker. It is in trying to render into English this multitude of corroborative expressions that one feels the paucity of the English in comparison with the Greek, and is impressed anew with the inadequacy of translation.

To illustrate this point, a study was made of Book Three of Plato's *Respublica*. Within forty-seven pages of the

Oxford text, a total of eighty-six different expressions of agreement or corroboration were used. The one most frequently employed, as might be expected, is the simple *vai*, occurring ten times; *kai mōla* was used eight times; *nōs* alone and in various combinations, such as *nōs yag* and *nōs yag ou*, a total of eighteen times; *alēthē* alone, in the superlative form, or in combination, was used eleven times; *ōgōwōs* and *ei yag* alone, or combined with other words, were used nine times each. Of the total eighty-six, twelve expressions were used five or more times; seventeen from two to five times. In thirty cases Plato shows agreement merely by repeating a leading word, usually the verb, from the previous speech.

This simple break-down of the techniques of the master will indicate one aspect of his art. However, true beauty, to be fully appreciated, should not be analyzed, but enjoyed in its composite perfection.

Sister M. Renelle Ojeman, S.S.N.D.

Notre Dame College,
Saint Louis, Missouri

Voices Prophetic?

A quotation from an anonymous writer¹ of the late twelfth century on "The Martyrdom of Saint Thomas of Canterbury" reveals an amazing series of words:

Satanae satellites irrumpentes templum
inaudium perpetrant sceleris exemplum. . . .

Perhaps it is the translation that is amazing, with its complete disregard of context and history, although with some appreciation of semantics: "The satellites of Satan, bursting into space, perpetrate an unheard of example of rascality."

Needless to say, the mediaeval "prophecy" is fulfilled; no application to our American satellites, when launched, is envisioned.

Lawrence A. Mann

University of Scranton

NOTE

¹ Stephen Gaselee, editor, *The Oxford Book of Medieval Latin Verse* (Oxford 1928) 128.

Book Reviews

Maurice van der Mijsbrugge, editor, *P. Cornelius Tacitus: Uitgelezen Teksten*. Antwerp, Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1957. Pp. xiii, 216.

Since the notes and editorial material of this booklet are in Flemish, it will not be useful in American schools as a text. It deserves, nevertheless, to be called to the attention of teachers, who could find it helpful in organizing a course in Tacitus. They might wish to profit from its choice of selections from all the works of Tacitus—interesting passages sufficiently extensive to convey a good idea of his striking style and vivid contents. And if able to make out the Flemish, they would appreciate the notes' comprehensiveness and relevance. Perhaps even an English edition might be called for, as there must be many college departments which would welcome an inexpensive and neat sampler of Tacitus on this level of appeal and reliability. The editor's excellent command of English would make this possible, if sufficient demand for the project develops. In any case, this addition to the *Palladium* series of school texts merits being known in this country, where its editor stored up (at Harvard) some of that learning and humanism from which this edition notably profits.

Raymond Victor Schoder, S.J.

West Baden College,
West Baden Springs, Indiana

Two Cumont Reprints: Franz Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra: Translated from the second revised French edition by Thos. J. McCormack*. New York, Dover Publications, 1956. Pp. xiv, 238. Paper-bound; \$1.85. Franz Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism: With an Introductory Essay by Grant Showerman*. New York, Dover Publications, 1956. Pp. xxiv, 298. Paper-bound; \$1.75.

It is a source of encouragement and gentle surprise to see the paperback publishers making available the two volumes under review in an age when sputniks are whirling above our heads, and scientific subjects are considered to hold the key to the future.

Cumont, a Belgian scholar of the first rank (*un des plus grands érudits que la Belgique ait donnés au monde*, says the short biographical sketch printed in his last work, *Lux Perpetua*), lived from 1868 to 1947. The works under review were among his first publications: *Mysteries* is translated from the French revision of 1902, and *Oriental Religions* is translated from the revision of 1909. Consequently these are not M. Cumont's final thoughts on these topics—he was contemplating another revision of *Mysteries* at the time of his death—but they are indicative of the views he held, and most of his conclusions, if I am not mistaken, are widely accepted today. As the years passed, the author became increasingly occupied with the idea of "afterlife" in Roman paganism, and his last work, the posthumously published *Lux Perpetua*, is a summation of his researches and views on this subject.

Oriental Religions is for me the more interesting of these paperback editions, owing to the wider variety of subjects discussed. Besides the chapter on Mithraism, there are treatments of Cybele, Serapis, the Syrian Atargatis, astrology and magic, and the final transformation of Roman paganism. The subject matter is of the kind that naturally appeals to the curious mind; but when it is treated with the unity and mastery and imagination that M. Cumont brings to his task, as well as with the pace that is set, the result is a book that is more engrossing than a novel.

The *Mysteries of Mithra* is in a certain sense more important if also more demanding, inasmuch as it provides a more complete investigation of the religious sect that was destined to battle to death with Christianity.

But the style of writing is as fluent as always, and in no wise cumbersome. After reading this study, one finds it hard to understand why the ordinary ancient history textbook passes by in almost complete silence this striking phase of Roman history.

Cumont is said to have been a friend of Loisy, and it may be noted that these two volumes were written when the Modernist ferment was agitating Western Europe. At such a time it was perhaps inevitable for M. Cumont to write: "As the religious history of the empire is studied more closely, the triumph of the Church will, in our opinion, appear more and more as the culmination of a long evolution of beliefs." If, as the context shows, this statement implies that the Church is the result of a series of purely human religious movements, we must believe that M. Cumont changed his mind on this matter in later life: at his own request he received the sacrament of Extreme Unction before his death.

Francis Joseph Guentner, S.J.

Saint Louis University

Waldo E. Sweet, *Latin: A Structural Approach* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Michigan Press, 1957). Pp. x, 520. Cloth, \$5.50; paper-bound, \$4.25.

Professor Sweet's book may well turn out to be a godsend for the all-too-numerous teachers of Latin who have been in the unlovely position of trying to teach Cicero or Vergil to students hopelessly unprepared to receive them. Frequently enough, even better students, beginning their work in the great classics, are found to look on them as little more than intellectual jig-saw puzzles, to be pieced together with a minimum of enjoyment and a maximum of effort.

Latin: A Structural Approach suggests a new solution, one which is the result of considerable experimental work on the part of Mr. Sweet and his associates at the University of Michigan. It is a textbook written professedly for classroom use, for the benefit of teachers who are dissatisfied with the traditional methods of teaching Latin and want to try something new.

One primary assumption is made: languages are different. The author contends that this is the diametric opposite of a principle which has been thought to underlie language study, namely, that there are certain basic similarities in all languages which can be utilized in teaching students a foreign tongue. The Michigan authorities disagree; the similarities are often superficial, they assert, and almost always more troublesome than valuable. On the conceptual level, for instance: "Language is a set of symbols which represent certain ideas. In learning a foreign language, you do not learn a new set of symbols for the concepts you already hold; you learn a new set of symbols for a new group of concepts" (p. 12). Consequently, any system relying to considerable degree on such similarities is bound to create numerous unnecessary difficulties.

Mr. Sweet suggests looking at the problem from a different point of view. His "structural approach," though easily

enough understood, could not be fully explicated in a short review such as this: I shall, however, try to give a simplified instance of it in operation.

Any word, be it in English, Latin, or Aztec, is made up of a number of "units of meaning" called "morphemes." *Laudabat* has three such: *laud*, the stem of the word, *aba*, indicating the tense, and *t*, giving the person. Each morpheme is significant, of course. The beginning Latin student is taught that in a noun the morpheme *m* will be connected with the objective case, whereas *s* (or a variant thereof) will be a sign of the nominative. Various Latin nouns are given for practice in morpheme recognition. He is then taught that the word with the *s* morpheme (subject) does something (verb) to the one with the *m* (object).

Thus far, the student has not learned the meaning of the words whose morphemes he has been analyzing. This comes partly through drawings (a lamb is drawn, with the caption *agnus*; a masked man carrying money bags is tagged *fur*, and so on), and partly through a study of English words derived from the Latin morpheme-examples—derivatives, be it noted, not a direct translation of the Latin word. Vocabulary work, however, is chiefly accomplished through repetition in a meaningful context as the course progresses.

All this leads up to the student's work on "basic sentences," some 360 short *sententiae* culled from a variety of Latin authors. The importance of these *sententiae* cannot be overstressed; they are, in a very real sense, the core of the course (Mr. Sweet insists that they be memorized). The student, now having some idea of the meaning of the Latin words with which he has been working, is told to take one of the *sententiae* and "metaphrase" it somewhat like this: "Vestis virum facit. Something (vestis)—does something to (facit)—something (virum). Clothes make the man." Later the sentence is varied, and we get *vestem vir facit*, to which the same "metaphrasing" process is applied.

This same over-all technique of structural analysis is applied throughout the book—always in the light of the basic sentences, which are lengthened, shortened, inverted, converted, depending on the demand of the subject matter to be taught.

Just to allay any fears, it should be mentioned that the structural approach is not one which neglects the "sands of grammar." The student will have a good grasp of declensions, syntax, and the like at the end of the course—but he will have learned them in a meaningful manner, rather than through brute memorization of paradigms and rules.

The book makes intelligent use of visual aids, principally in the form of the captioned drawings. One such, for instance, depicting a man modeling clothes (entitled *Vestis virum facit*) will be placed alongside another, captioned *Vestem vir facit* and showing a man sewing a garment. Auditory helps—tapes, and so on—are useful, but not absolutely necessary.

In the back of the book there is a fairly large selection of narrative readings, designed to be used in conjunction with the later lessons (22-35). Each reading is accompanied by a Latin paraphrase and a series of Latin questions (to be answered in Latin) on the text. These selections are taken from Martial, Phaedrus, Catullus, and others.

Mr. Sweet estimates that college freshman classes could proceed at the rate of one lesson per class meeting, high-school students at about half this speed. There are 35 lessons in all. In a personal communication, Mr. Sweet told the present writer that on completion of this text, *students should be able to move on to Vergil*.

It is generally perilous to wax eloquent on the merits of a book like this before having seen the method in operation and carefully studied the results attained over a period of time. Hence I would hesitate at this early date to term Mr. Sweet's book a panacea for all Latin's ills. However, this much is certainly safe to say, that it is filled with great promise, and deserves the thoughtful and careful perusal of any classics teacher interested in progress.

Martin D. O'Keefe, S.J.

Saint Louis University

Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J., *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*. New York, Philosophical Library, 1957. Pp. 785. \$10.00.

Perhaps the easiest way of summarizing one's initial reaction to Father Lonergan's book is by saying that it is impressive in length, in depth, and in scope. In length it runs to nearly eight hundred pages. Its depth is reflected in the author's fertile acquaintance with the methodologies of mathematics and empiriological sciences, in his comprehensive

vision of the
of philosophy
lates his o
book aims
itself. This
(as, for ex
logical sci
with regar
affording
"Thorough
advises, "a
all there is
hase, an in
ments of u
One ma
philosophic
when know
point of a
exist but t
Sciences E
to take a

Saint Louis

L. R. L.
From the
(20). Bos
488; paper
In his in
traditional
following
(2) 240 B.
Age begin
However,
180 A.D.
beyond the
anthologist
its humble
Mediaeval
and most
reader. M
prehensive
form avail
Eight y
ing of the
Lind's fur
classics an
lation, as
reader an
English t
poetry ce
respect. A
are worki
ought and
ancient L
for the fi
Mr. Lin
tains som
modern p
discussion
classificat
tion and n
modern li
Considera
poetry m
significan
of "great
This ex
Naevius,
Plautus, I
berius, P
Tibullus,
Epigraph
Seneca, S
Servasius
Nola, Avi
Prudenti
Saint Co
Damian,
vaux, Sai
of Morias
Archpoet
of the P
Sannazar
Richard

vision of the history of ideas, in his searching understanding of philosophical problems, before which he competently formulates his own metaphysical position. In scope, finally, the book aims at achieving no less than an insight into insight itself. This latter is considered, first, as a cognitional activity (as, for example, it shows up in mathematics and in empirical sciences) and then, from the data thereby gained with regard to man's "pure desire to know" (p. 348), as affording a basis for a valid and perennial philosophy. "Thoroughly understand what it is to understand," the author advises, "and not only will you understand the broad lines of all there is to be understood but also you will possess a fixed base, an invariant pattern, opening upon all further developments of understanding" (p. 748).

One may personally disagree with the author on certain philosophical issues—for example, that material existents, when known directly and perceptually, cannot be the starting point of a genuine metaphysics. Nevertheless, little doubt can exist but that, in the words of a recent review (F. Crowe, S.J., *Sciences Ecclesiastiques* 9 [1957] 270), this book is "destined to take a place among the great books of modern thought."

Charles Leo Sweeney, S.J.

Saint Louis University

L. R. Lind, editor, *Latin Poetry in Verse Translation: From the Beginnings to the Renaissance* (Riverside Editions C20). Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957. Pp. xxxix, 438; paper-bound. \$1.45.

In his introduction, Professor L. R. Lind enumerates the traditional division of classical Latin literature into the following four chronological periods: (1) 500 B.C.-240 B.C.; (2) 240 B.C.-70 B.C.; (3) 70 B.C. (with the so-called Golden Age beginning in 50 B.C.)-14 A.D.; (4) 14 A.D.-180 A.D. However, his view of Latin literature does not end it in 180 A.D. but carries it through the Middle Ages down to and beyond the Renaissance. It is the avowed purpose of the anthology to exhibit the wide range of Latin poetry from its humble beginnings, through its most brilliant periods into Mediaeval Latin and Renaissance Latin poetry, in the best and most meaningful translations available to the modern reader. Mr. Lind's anthology is undoubtedly the most comprehensive single volume of Latin translation in paperback form available today.

Eight years of work went into the collecting and organizing of the material that constitutes this volume. One of Mr. Lind's fundamental ideas behind this book is that, if the classics are to be read and taught more and more in translation, as certainly seems to be the trend, then the general reader and the student should have ready access to the finest English translations available. This anthology of Latin poetry certainly does an excellent piece of work in this respect. A considerable number of the translations included are works of creative modern poetic minds, which have sought and successfully obtained poetic inspiration from the ancient Latin poets. Some Latin poets are here translated for the first time in readable verse translations.

Mr. Lind's excellent introduction (pp. xiii-xxxix) contains some stimulating discussions of the relationship of modern poetry and poets to Latin poetry and poets. These discussions also point the need for closer association of the classicist with contemporary trends in poetry. His introduction and notes make facile use of the views of such important modern literary figures as Ezra Pound and T. S. Eliot. Consideration of such views in their relationship to classical poetry may and can provide a basis for revitalizing the significance of classical poetry within the total framework of "great world literature."

This excellent anthology contains selections from Ennius, Naevius, Pacuvius, and Lucilius (a good feature, indeed), Plautus, Lucretius, Catullus, Furius Bibaculus, Decimus Laberius, Pubilius Syrus, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Propertius, Tibullus, Domitius Marsus, Sulpicia, Sulpicia II, *Carmine Epigraphica*, Persius, Lucan, Petronius, Martial, Juvenal, Seneca, Statius, Hadrian, Aulus Gellius, Sulpicius Lupercus Servasius, Jr., *Pervigilium Veneris*, Ausonius, Paulinus of Nola, Avianus, Claudian, Flavius Vopiscus, Saint Ambrose, Prudentius, Boethius, Venantius Fortunatus, Octavianus, Saint Columban, Alcuin, Paul the Deacon, Saint Peter Damian, Hildebert of Le Mans, Abelard, Bernard of Clairvaux, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Thomas of Celano, Bernard of Morlas, *Carmine Burana*, Hugh Primas of Orléans, the Archpoet of Cologne, Walter of Chatillon, select Latin poets of the Renaissance, Ianus Vitalis Panormitanus, Jacopo Sannazaro, Politian, Johannes Secundus, George Herbert, Richard Crashaw, and a number of anonymous poets. This

mere list is sufficient to give the reader an idea of the ambitious sweep of Latin poetry that the editor attempts. The Roman comic poet Terence is conspicuously not represented in this anthology for some unknown reason. There are notes (pp. 401-431) and a brief bibliography (pp. 433-434) at the end of the book. There are also two short indices: one of the poets and sources; another of the translators. The author of each group of selections is introduced with an appropriate introduction.

Undoubtedly, one could find faults with this anthology and its translations, but the virtues of this collection far outweigh its weaknesses. For readability, for smoothness, for accuracy of poetic mood if not always of literal translation, this collection is superb.

John E. Rexine

Colgate University

Walter R. Agard, *The Greek Mind* (Anvil Books No. 17). Princeton, New Jersey, Van Nostrand, 1957. Pp. 186; paper-bound, \$1.25.

Those misguided persons who would claim that the classics are dead and do not generate the interest nor wield the influence in education that Greek and Latin used to have in former days would do well to take a look at the abundance of excellent and inexpensive paperback books that have recently flooded the market—books on Greek and Roman subjects and books that contain translations of Greek and Latin authors into the contemporary English idiom. One could easily be tempted to assert that the classics (albeit in translation) now have a wider circulation than ever before, and that there is a constant demand on the part of the public for more inexpensive paperbacks on classical subjects.

Walter R. Agard's *The Greek Mind* is another such classical paperback, published in the Van Nostrand Anvil Book Series, a series that is under the capable general editorship of Professor Louis L. Snyder of the City College of New York. This series includes handy books in the fields of history and the social sciences, and it is heartening to see a classicist as distinguished as Professor Agard of the University of Wisconsin joining the ranks of the contributors to this project.

It would be unfair to say that Professor Agard's book is a profound or penetrating analysis of the Greek mind. His own text, which comprises pp. 9-86, is an extremely general account of the Greek historical background and only in a very superficial way is it an account of the "Greek mind," as far as his own text is concerned. The Readings, however, are a completely different story. They occupy the bulk of the book and are Mr. Agard's translations of passages from the Greek authors ranging from Homer to the Greek Anthology (p. 89-183). These prose translations are generally excellent and contain some of the finest passages in Greek literature. Unfortunately, the size of the book has obviously limited the number of such passages that could be included, but the author has endeavored primarily to illustrate his chapters on "The Greek Mind." This in itself is an excellent idea. His chapters include three parallel groupings ("The Setting," "Man, Nature, and God," "Man and Society," "Foreign Relations"; and "Individual Values," with "Heroic Virtues" replacing "Man and Society" in the first grouping). The chronological periods covered include the archaic, the classical, and the Hellenistic.

Properly used, this book can be a great asset in general courses in classical civilization, ancient history, or general education. Teachers of ancient history and the classics in secondary schools would also do well to consider this book. Mr. Agard's chapters on "The Greek Mind," together with the selected Readings from the original Greek authors, could, under the guidance of a competent teacher, be profitably utilized as a workbook of Greek civilization or Greek history.

There are a few points that could stand clarification. In his discussion of Plato's "communism" (pp. 49-50), the author should have made it abundantly clear that Plato's "communism" of property is primarily based on moral grounds (unlike the Marxist view, which is based on economic arguments) and is limited, as Professor Agard correctly points out, only to the rulers and guardians. On p. 52, a much better view of Herodotus as an historian could have been presented. There is no critical evaluation here. In his discussion of the Stoics (p. 73-74), some mention should have been made of Marcus Aurelius and his views on Stoicism. On p. 80, Polybius' dates are given as 210-128, but on p. 173 they are listed as c.203-c.120. In the bibliography, on p. 185, Richmond Lattimore (whose excellent trans-

lation of the *Iliad* is ignored, but whose translation of Pindar's *Carmina* is cited) is erroneously referred to as Richard Lattimore. The bibliography (pp. 185-186) is brief but readily useful and really not too difficult for those who are unfamiliar with the classics but have proper guidance.

All in all, Mr. Agard has produced a handy little book which can be useful in the classroom for Greek history, classical civilization, and general education courses, as well as for the interested general reader. He has nobly striven to "... examine certain basic problems and patterns of Greek life which are especially pertinent to twentieth century America, including international relations, the rights of minorities, and individual values."

John E. Rexine

Colgate University

For Virgil himself it <the hexameter> remained to the last a matter of perpetual labour and endless experiment. By elaboration of periodic structure, by constant variation of stress and pause, by avoidance of tripping runs and heavy masses, by innumerable verbal or syntactical devices, he made a stubborn material flexible and supple: he gave the language a new music. In this he is like Milton in English poetry. But their methods were different. Milton, debarred by blindness from the help of pen and paper, had to compose *Paradise Lost* in his head and dictated a passage only when he had got it into satisfactory form. Wordsworth, it is interesting to note, did the same thing without the same reason; he did not draft on paper, and when by mental labour that amounted to agony he had got a poem into shape, would make his sister or his wife write it down from his dictation. Virgil, we are told, wrote a first draft and then worked on it until perhaps there was not a word of the first draft left. The *Aeneid* at his death was still full of gaps and stop-gaps, of alternative lines, of passages tentatively cancelled or provisionally inserted, of erasures and interlineations.—J. W. Mackail, *Virgil and His Meaning to the World of To-Day*.

Color Slides On Classical Subjects

by Raymond V. Schoder, S.J., Ph.D.

Widely famous for their outstanding clarity, beauty, and composition. Include striking air views.

Helpful accompanying notes.

Copied by a special process to insure superior sharpness and color fidelity.

Price: \$12 a set (20 slides, at 60c each). In 2x2" card-board mounts. With titles and boxed.

Subjects offered: six different sets, 20 slides in each:

- A. GREECE I: Athens and central and northern Greece.
- B. GREECE II: Peloponnesus and Islands.
- C. ROME: the chief remains.
- D. ROME AND HER EMPIRE: Roman sites in Europe, Britain, N. Africa, Asia Minor.
- E. CLASSIC ITALY: Pompeii, Paestum, Cannae, Tusculum, Baiae, Verona, Sicily, etc.
- F. VERGIL'S WORLD: Troy, Carthage, Cumae, Avernus, Naples, etc.

WRITE

for detailed list of contents and order blank, to:

Photo Service Dept., West Baden College,
West Baden Springs, Ind.

Materials Available

through the Office of The Classical Bulletin

Richard E. Arnold, S.J., Editor CLASSICAL ESSAYS PRESENTED TO JAMES A. KLEIST, S.J.

Containing an INTRODUCTION by the Editor, with articles by Walter R. Agard, William H. Alexander, Norman J. DeWitt, Charles C. Mierow, Clyde Murley, John A. Scott, Francis A. Sullivan, S.J.

Each, \$2.50

Thomas P. Byrne, S.J.

FACETE DICTUM: A LATIN READER WITH A DASH OF HUMOR

Light-hearted reading for those with a year and a half or more of systematic training in Latin.

Each, \$1.00

General Index

TO VOLUMES 1-25 OF THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN (1924-1949)

Each, 50c

William R. Hennes, S.J., and Richard E. Arnold, S.J.

IRIS: A READING LIST OF ARTICLES SELECTED FROM CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

Chosen from nine periodicals from the beginning of each until August 1, 1941.

Each, \$1.50

Leo M. Kaiser

T. MACCIUS PLAUTUS, THE CAPTIVES: EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION, NOTES, AND VOCABULARY

Intended for rapid reading in lower classes.

Each, \$1.25

William C. Korfmacher

OTHLONI LIBELLUS PROVERBIORUM

Critical and annotated edition of an eleventh-century proverb collection.

Each, \$2.00

O. J. Kuhnmuensch, S.J.

AIDS FOR THE RHYTHMIC READING OF VERGIL

SOME AIDS TO LATIN

Each, 5c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 4c

Raymond V. Schoder, S.J.

CLASSICAL BOOKS FOR HIGH SCHOOL NEEDS

Each, 5c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 4c

Sense-Line Texts . . .

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO PRIMA (Peterson)

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO TERTIA (Bachhuber)

Cicero, IN CATILINAM ORATIO QUARTA (Ciunta)

Cicero, PRO ARCHIA (Peterson)

Each, 25c; in lots of 12 or more, each, 20c

Address:

The Classical Bulletin

3647 West Pine Boulevard

Saint Louis 8, Missouri

All items are sent plus postage

Volume 34

etin

with
Alex-
row,
ulli-
2.50

H A

and
atin.
1.00

50c

S.J.

3
ning
1.50

1.25

nth-
2.00

, 4c

, 4c

20c